## REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain pending with claims 1, 17, and 18 being independent. Applicants submit new dependent claim 44 for consideration.

Applicants' remarks follow the text of the Office Action, which appears in small, bolded print below.

**Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allison (USP 6,373,848) in view of Belkin (USP 6,604,125).**

**With respect to claims 1, 3, 17, and 18 see at least the abstract Figures 1 and 9 and the description in the specification of Allison. Allison teaches a method of receiving data from a network (lines 12-13, col. 11) comprising:**

**Issuing a request (see Figure 9 and the description in col. 11) directing a transfer of data from one of a plurality of device ports (ports 1-n in Figure 1) to a storage unit (see registers or FIFO) and specifying (instruction program counter) a thread (instructions, see line 57, col. 2) to process (control logic 34) the data.**

**Allison teaches that each FIFO provides instructions (thread) to control logic for controlling transmitting and receiving data between the host system and the network. Allison does not teach plurality of threads. However, Belkin teaches a server for receiving data from a network (see Figure 1). The server has a storage for storing a pool of threads and a thread selector. In response to a request, a specific thread from a plurality of threads is selected to process the task requested by the request. Since both references are directed to transceiving data between a host and a network, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide a pool of threads as taught by Belkin in Allison so that specific tasks such as transmitting or receiving can be respectively controlled by specific threads.**

The Examiner has not identified a single request that both directs "a transfer of data from one of a plurality of device ports to a storage unit and" specifies "a thread ... to process the data" as recited by claim 1.

In Allison, received data is transferred from the different ports into the RxFIFO 43 via the multiplexer 18, RxMII Interface 22, and RxMAC 28 (see FIG. 1). Eventually, the RxFIFO 43 of Allison signals control logic 34 that data in the RxFIFO 43 is ready to be

transferred to the host (col. 11, lines 46-53). The Examiner has identified RxFIFO 43 (or alternately registers 30) as being the storage unit of claim 1. The signaling from the RxFIFO 43 to the control logic 34, however, does not direct transfer of data from one of the ports to the RxFIFO 43 or registers 30. As described above, this transfer from the ports into the RxFIFO 43 has already occurred when the RxFIFO 43 signals the control logic 34. Thus, the signaling between the RxFIFO 43 and the control logic 34 does not provide a request to "direct a transfer of data" and specify "a thread" as recited by claim 1, nor would such a request make sense in the design of Allison. Thus, even if Allison somehow was modified to feature the complexity of the multi-threaded design of Belkin, Allison still would not provide the subject matter recited by claim 1 (or claims 17 or 18 which recite similar language).

**In the communication filed on 2/23/2004, Applicants appear to contend that the term thread as used by Applicants in their specification has different meaning that commonly accepted in the art. It should be noted that the terms in the claims should be given their broadest interpretation and limitations in the specification should not be read into the claims. Further, the claims clearly specify that the threads are processing program threads and which is line with the commonly accepted meaning. See also the term "thread" in Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 4th edition on page 442. Furthermore, Applicants fail to explain how the steps would have different effect if the term thread in the steps is interpreted differently.**

In preparing the previously filed response, Applicants mistakenly believed the Examiner's position was that Allison provided threads. After reviewing the previous and current Office Actions, Applicants realize that this was not the Examiner's position at all and Applicants apologize for the confusion. In any event, Applicants did not intend to alter the interpretation of the term thread.

Fees for the additional claim and two-month extension of time are being submitted with this amendment. If any other fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1050 referencing attorney docket number: 10559-137001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/7/04

Denis G. Maloney
Reg. No. 29,670

ATTORNEYS FOR INTEL
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906